

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/082,603	02/22/2002	Ming Yan	LWM-A078	5733	
75	90 03/24/2004	EXAMINER			
•	URABITO & HAO LLI	PAK, SUNG H			
Third Floor Two North Mar	ket Street	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Jose, CA 95113			2874		
			DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No		Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/082,603		YAN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Sung H. Pak		2874				
The MAILING DATE of this of Period for Reply	communication appe	ears on the cove	r sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS CO - Extensions of time may be available under the after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date - If the period for reply specified above is less the - If NO period for reply is specified above, the mailing the set or extended perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended perion - Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	MMUNICATION. provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 f this communication. Ian thirty (30) days, a reply viaximum statutory period will of for reply will, by statute, the months after the mailing of	6(a). In no event, how within the statutory mill apply and will expire cause the application	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from to to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered time the mailing date of this coor (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. communication.			
Status								
1) Responsive to communication	on(s) filed on							
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This a	action is non-fir	al.					
- / 	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers	,							
9) The specification is objected 10) The drawing(s) filed on Applicant may not request that Replacement drawing sheet(s) 11) The oath or declaration is ob	_ is/are: a) ☐ acce any objection to the d including the correction	epted or b) ob drawing(s) be held on is required if the	I in abeyance. See ne drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachment(s)								
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing 		_	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te	0.450)			
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0202</u>. 	D-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	·	Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PT)	U-152)			

Art Unit: 2874

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

All references cited in the information disclosure statement filed 2/22/2002 have been considered. Please refer to the initialed copy of PTO-1449 enclosed herewith.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-10, 12, 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al (US 5,940,548).

Yamada et al reference discloses an optical device with all the limitations set forth in the claims, including: measuring a phase error of a plurality of waveguide cores of an arrayed

Art Unit: 2874

waveguide grating using a low coherent optical interferometer (column 14 lines 34-41); adjusting the refractive indexes of the respective cores in accordance with the measured phase error values via a laser (column 14 lines 42-44). Adjusting the refractive indexes of the cores effectively changes the optical path lengths and optimizes the response of the arrayed waveguide grating.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al (US 5,940,548).

Regarding claims 3, and 11, Yamada et al reference discloses an optical device with all the limitations set forth in the claims as discussed above, except it does not explicitly disclose that phase errors are measured to within nanometer resolution. However, measuring phase errors

Art Unit: 2874

within nanometer resolution is known in the art. Nanometer resolution is advantageous and desirable because it allows for accurate and precise adjustment of phase error, which is desirable in building reliable optical communications device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yamada et al device to have nanometer resolution phase error measurement.

Regarding claims 5,13, and 17, Yamada et al reference discloses an optical device with all the limitations set forth in the claims as discussed above, except it does not explicitly teach the use of ultraviolet laser energy. However, the use of ultraviolet laser in changing refractive indexes of optical waveguides is well known and common in the art. The use of ultraviolet laser is advantageous and desirable because it provides a simple and cost-effective way of modifying refractive indexes of optical waveguides without having to impart structural changes to the waveguides. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yamada et al device to use ultraviolet lasers.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 20030035640A1- paragraph [0080], US 20010051018A1- paragraph [0043], and US 6442311B1- column 1 lines 59-62 all describe a method of adjusting refractive indexes of waveguiding cores in accordance with measured phase error values.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sung H. Pak whose telephone number is (571) 272-2353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 6:30am- 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2874

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Azz

Sung H. Pak Examiner Art Unit 2874

sp

HEMANG SANGHAVI PEMARY EXAMINER